UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,364	01/22/2004	Naoko Ito	Q79465	3421
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 11/25/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			SHAW, PELING ANDY	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2444	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/25/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/761,364	ITO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
PELING A. SHAW	2444	

PELING A. SHAW 2444
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 09 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expires <u>3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</u>
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
AMENDMENTS
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>15-39</u> .
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:
/Peling A Shaw/ Examiner, Art Unit 2444

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has argued that Lonnfors does not teach or suggest the limitation of "determining the presence information for [a first] presentity... based on a change in the presence information for [a second presentity] other than said [first] presentity" (see 5th paragraph on page 2 of current amendment). Applicant particularly argued that Lonnfors does not disclose the status of a first presentity of a user, who is operating a UE and has their own first presentity, changes based on a change in the second (i. e., "other") monitored presentity's status. Similarly, Lonnfors does not disclose that the status of a first, monitored presentity changes (see 1st paragraph on page 3 of current amendment and 2nd paragraph on page 5). The argued limitation as per claim 1 presented on page 9 of amendment received on 05/18/2009 reads "a presence calculating means for determing the presence information for said presentity provided by said presence service client means based on a change in the presence information for the presentities other than said presentity received by said presence service client means". Lonnfors has been quoted to disclose (column 8, lines 8-22) partial notification regarding only changed presence information change; (column 11, line 60- column 12, line 13) providing partial notification to a watcher application for client/watcher to determine whether it is in synchronization with the presence server and identifying actions, e.g. the presence document sent to a subscribing watcher application; and (column 1, lines 54-63) presence information from the presence servers about other users. It is clear that Lonnfors does teach or suggest a presence server providing piratical notification regarding only changed presence information change to others..